



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

144

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,539	12/29/2005	Rajendra Kumar	117210.00045	7033

21324 7590 10/22/2007
HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP
One GOJO Plaza
Suite 300
AKRON, OH 44311-1076

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2618

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/22/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@hahnlaw.com
akron-docket@hotmail.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/542,539

Applicant(s)

KUMAR, RAJENDRA

Examiner

Tuan A. Tran

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-33,36 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 34,35 and 38-40 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 31-33 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bodnar et al. (7,072,688).

Regarding claim 31, Bodnar discloses a communication apparatus 10, 30 to provide input/output functionality in conjunction with an off-the shelf portable computing device 20, the communication apparatus 10, 30 comprising a portable housing having at least two selectable docking ports such that the communication apparatus is capable of mechanically docking and electrically interfacing (via docking module 10) to a portable computing device 20 in at least two operable configurations to the portable computing device 20 (See figs. 1A, 3A, 3B and col. 6 line 44 to col. 7 line 36).

Regarding claim 32, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 31. Bodnar further discloses the communication apparatus 10, 30 is a cellular phone 30, and is selectively docked to the portable computing device 20 to provide wireless communication capabilities for an integrated system formed when docked therewith (See col. 3 lines 58-60, col. 4 lines 13-38).

Regarding claim 33, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 32. Bodnar further discloses the communication apparatus 10, 30 includes interface keypad, a display (cellular phone is widely known to include keypad and display), and a docking connector 40, 70 for mating with a standard electrical connector 60 associated with the portable computing device 20 (See fig. 1A and col. 6 lines 10-67).

Regarding claim 36, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 32. Bodnar further discloses the cellular phone 30 is fully operational when docked with the portable computing device 20 or when undocked, and data maybe exchanged between the portable computing device 20 and the cellular phone 30 via a docking connector 40, 60, 70 (See fig. 1A and col. 4 lines 13-38, col. 6 lines 10-67).

Regarding claim 37, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 32. Bodnar further discloses the cellular phone 30 includes a first side having at least a first interface keypad, a display (cellular phone is widely known to include keypad and display), and a first docking connector (See fig. 1A), and a back side having at least a second docking connector for mating with an electrical connector associated with the portable computing device (See fig. 3A and 3B).

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 34-35 and 38-40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 34, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 31. However, Bodnar does not explicitly mention that the communication apparatus includes a keypad

Art Unit: 2618

interface on both sides thereof, one of which is accessible when docked to the portable computing device in at least one operable configuration and the other of which is accessible when docked to the portable computing device in at least one other operable configuration as specified in claim and in accordance with the applicant's argument (See Remark, page 6 lines 23-27).

Regarding claim 35, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 31. However, Bodnar does not explicitly mention that the communication apparatus is docked to the front of the portable computing device such that a docking connector of the portable computing device mates with a docking connector on the communication apparatus, with the front of the communication apparatus facing outward and the back of the communication apparatus covering a display of the portable computing device to act as a lid for the portable computing device as specified in claim and in accordance with the applicant's argument (See Remark, page 7 lines 19-25).

Regarding claim 38-40, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 37. However, Bodnar does not explicitly mention that the back side of the communication apparatus further comprises a second keypad for data entry, wherein the communication apparatus may be docked in its front side or back side facing the portable computing device as specified in claim.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 31-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant argued and tried to establish a case of direct interfacing between the portable computing device and the communication apparatus (See Remark, page 5 second paragraph to page 6 first paragraph). Such limitation **"interfacing directly"** is not recited in claim. In this instant case, Bodnar clearly discloses the communication apparatus is capable of mechanically docking and electrically interfacing (via docking module 10) to a portable computing device 20 in at least two operable configurations to the portable computing device 20 (See figs. 1A, 3A, 3B and col. 6 line 44 to col. 7 line 36).

The applicant argued that Bodnar does not teach or suggest that data may be exchanged between the portable computing device and the communication apparatus when docked (See Remark, page 6 fourth paragraph to page 7 first paragraph). The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument. Bodnar does disclose that data can be exchanged between the two devices (See col. 4 lines 4-38, col. 6 lines 44-67).

The applicant argued that Bodnar fails to teach the arrangement as specified in claim 37 (See Remark, page 7 second paragraph). The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument. Bodnar does teach such arrangement in figures 3A and 3B (See above rejections for details).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7858. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:00AM-6:30PM.

Art Unit: 2618

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Tuan Tran
AU 2618